

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-10, 12-14, and 16-20 are pending in this application. In the office action mailed April 1, 2008 office action, the Examiner:

A. Rejected claims 1-6, 12-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,982,234 to Filion; and

B. Rejected claims 7-11, 15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion in view of Well Known Prior Art MPEP 2144.03.

In this response, claims 1-10, 12-14, and 16-20 have been amended. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

II. Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended in a substantially similar manner. For example, each of claims 1 and 12 has been amended to include a limitation similar to the following: "the group of pages identified within the document numbering less than a total number of pages in the document, and the naming convention being an alphanumeric identifier that identifies the group of pages without requiring an operator to identify each page in the group individually."

III. The Rejection of Claims 1-20 Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 1-6, 12-14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Filion. For the reasons discussed below, Filion does not teach, show or suggest each and every limitation of these claims, as amended.

A. Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Filion. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that "the group of pages identified within the document numbering less than a total number of pages in the document, and the naming convention being an alphanumeric identifier that identifies the group of pages without requiring an operator to identify each page in the group individually." Thus, claim 1 requires that the naming convention be an alphanumeric identifier that identifies a group of pages within a document that number less than a total number of pages in the document to enable identification of the group without requiring an operator to identify each page in the group individually. The Filion reference does not disclose such a naming convention. Instead, Filion requires that an operator register a document start position with scroll buttons, activate a group button to enable a document window, require the operator to depress the scroll buttons until the number for the last document position in the group is reached, and then select the exception program features to be applied to the group. *Filion*, col. 10, lines 57-68. If the operator selects a feature to be applied to the group before the last document position in the group is identified, the group identification is canceled. Thus, Filion requires the operator to scroll through documents contiguously to identify

the pages for a group. The claimed method only requires selection of a naming convention to identify a group within a document that has fewer pages than the entire document. Because Filion only teaches registration of a start point in a document, followed by activation of the group identification function, a scrolling operation to identify the end point for the group, and entry of exception programming features before the group identification is set, it does not teach or suggest the claimed method.

B. Claims 2-10

Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 2-10 should be withdrawn as well.

C. Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Therefore, the arguments presented above in connection with claim 1 are applicable to claim 12, as amended. Accordingly, for at least those reasons given above in connection with claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 12, as amended, should be withdrawn as well.

D. Claims 13-14, and 16-20

Claims 13-14, and 16-20 depend directly or indirectly from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those set forth above in connection with claim 12, Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 13-14, and 16-20 should be withdrawn as well.

E. Section 103 Ground of Rejection

The section 103 ground of rejection falls because Fillion does not provide the foundation for rejection of the independent base claim. Consequently, it cannot properly form the basis of an obviousness rejection of a dependent claim. Additionally, Applicants note that the citation of Applicants' specification appears to be in error as the words that the Examiner quoted from the specification at page 10, namely, "conventional approach," are not present in the cited portion of the application. In fact, the words "conventional approach," "conventional" alone, or "approach" alone, are not used in the specification. Consequently, Applicants are unable to understand what the Examiner meant by putting those words in quotation marks. At the very least, the Examiner's contentions regarding well known prior art seem to be without adequate support for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Therefore, the section 103 grounds of rejection for claims 7-10, and 18-20 should be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit a patentable contribution to the art has been made. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account number 24-0037.

Respectfully submitted,
MAGINOT, MOORE & BECK LLP

/David M. Lockman/
David M. Lockman
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,214

June 30, 2008
Maginot, Moore & Beck LLP
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
(317) 638-2922 Telephone
(317) 638-2139 Facsimile